

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 295

JC 820 538

AUTHOR McIntyre, Chuck
TITLE Comprehensive Planning.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE 10 Dec 82
NOTE 25p.; Discussed at the meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (San Francisco, CA, December 9-10, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *College Planning; *Community Colleges; Evaluation Methods; *Institutional Evaluation; Long Range Planning; Organizational Objectives; *State School District Relationship; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Work to develop and test new statewide planning and evaluation procedures for the California community colleges is described in this paper, which provides background information, outlines the proposed comprehensive planning process, and discusses the use of statewide priorities. A background section describes current planning and evaluation activities and underscores the need for more comprehensive procedures. Proposed remedies to the problems created by top-to-bottom planning and widely dispersed and ill-defined evaluation responsibilities are then outlined, with focus on a joint project involving the Chancellor's Office and the Western Association Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in the development of a method for sharing planning and evaluation as part of the institutional accreditation process; and on the work of the Chancellor's Office Task Force on Planning and Compliance. Next, a prospective planning and review process is presented, which encompasses programs and courses, facilities, extended opportunity programs and services, occupational education, handicapped student programs and services, affirmative action, calendars/schedules, innovative projects, student support services, and finances. Timetables for implementing the plan and accomplishing specific tasks are provided. Finally, plans to develop statewide priorities, guidelines for colleges in assessing their achievement of these priorities, and the value of such assessments and their relation to accreditation are explained. (KL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
December 10, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Title: Comprehensive Planning
Staff Presentation: Chuck McIntyre
Director of Analytical Studies

Summary

This item describes work to develop and test new planning and evaluation procedures for the Board of Governors. These procedures would be carried out in cooperation with the Western Association Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

An integral part of the proposed new procedures is the use of statewide priorities to review community college plans and practices. The priorities rely on work by the Board at its retreat in August 1982 and in subsequent followup activities. (A draft statement of statewide priorities was discussed by the Board at its October 1982 meeting.)

Also supporting these proposed procedures is work carried on in the Fund for Improvement for Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) Project and by the Chancellor's Office Planning and Compliance Task Force. (See membership of these groups in Appendix A.) Task Force work formed the basis for many of the proposals in this item.

It is proposed that all districts be asked to review and comment on the Board's statewide priorities during 1982-83. In addition, those colleges undergoing accreditation self-studies during 1982-83 (in preparation for site visits during 1983-84) will be asked to evaluate their progress toward the statewide priorities as part of their self-study.

If the Board endorses the proposed planning strategy, staff will proceed in an effort to consolidate planning and review activities of the Chancellor's Office into a comprehensive planning process, the timing and content of which would be coordinated with accreditation. This new comprehensive planning process would be phased in gradually, beginning in 1983-84. Under this process, an intensive evaluation and projection of future needs and strategies would be scheduled for each district once every five years in conjunction with accreditation and would be followed by an annual update.

In order to avoid placing additional burdens on districts, the new process will make maximum use of existing tools such as the accreditation self-study, Chancellor's Office Information System, existing planning and evaluation models, and of new tools developed through the support of the FIPSE Project. Tools, process, and priorities all will be tested during the next two years and if found to be successful, the structure will be recommended for continued use.

ED223295

VC 820 538

This item contains background on events leading to this work, an outline of the proposed comprehensive planning process, and discussion of the use of statewide priorities.

The Education Policy Committee considered this item at its meeting of October 28. Testimony was heard that the proposed Statement of Mission and Statewide Priorities would damage local control. One witness asked that each college rather than each district be required to prepare a comprehensive plan.

After discussion, the Committee revised the language of the proposed **recommendation** to avoid any impression that **the** Statement of Mission and **Statewide Priorities** was **being endorsed** or adopted. Discussion by Committee members indicated the intent that comprehensive planning should **proceed** regardless of **the** Board's handling of its Statement.

Recommended Action

The Board of **Governors** should **endorse the** proposed strategy for developing and testing new planning and evaluation procedures, including the proposed timetable, beginning on page 7. Staff should be directed to develop the format, timing, and review sequence of comprehensive planning for further Board review in the Spring 1983.

Background

During the past decade, the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges have taken steps to improve community college evaluation and planning. At present, however, there are no comprehensive planning and evaluation processes to ensure that districts pursue statewide educational objectives. Nor is there any mechanism to ensure that these statewide objectives reflect local community concerns and the need for effective use of resources by districts and colleges.

A variety of planning activities takes place at both the state and local levels for the California Community Colleges. In general, the Chancellor's Office reviews college and district plans for new educational programs and certain courses, facilities, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, handicapped student programs and services, occupational education, affirmative action and innovative projects.

Serious efforts at comprehensive planning began in 1975, with development of the Board of Governors' first Five-Year Plan. This first Five-Year Plan recommended a number of changes in planning procedures and set forth a Board of Governors' statement of philosophy and goals for California Community Colleges. This statement has served as a point-of-departure for many subsequent efforts.

The Plan was updated in 1977 with a series of multiyear policy directives and objectives designed to achieve the Board goals. Only some of these objectives have been achieved. The Plan was essentially a "top-down" document despite a concerted attempt to involve local college trustees, staff, and students. Plan objectives were developed from a state-level perspective, rather than being aggregated from local-level perspectives and plans.

Passage of Proposition 13 (1978) dramatically altered the way community colleges were financed and efforts were diverted from implementing the Five-Year Plan to solving the major fiscal dilemma resulting from Proposition 13. The Chancellor's Office temporarily shelved further updates of the Plan and turned its efforts to more specific, long-term finance planning and the continued development of plans for such specific programs as EOPS, capital outlay, and handicapped.

After more than a year of study and discussion, the Board of Governors, in 1979, endorsed a series of principles and a Long-Term Finance Plan for the 1980's, much of which has been incorporated in subsequent legislation. In this Plan, funding techniques were to be accompanied by a new planning and accountability process. This process would seek to provide needed accountability for both state and local policymakers, focusing on statewide objectives but without resorting to extensive use of categorical funding or state-level review of district budgets.

Existing responsibilities for evaluating community college operations are widely dispersed and not well defined, and duplication of effort is apparent. Different perspectives of federal, state, local, and various professional agencies reflect that somewhat competing objectives of (1) local autonomy and (2) accountability for the public resources allocated to community colleges.

The Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and the Department of Finance both evaluate community colleges to some extent. CPEC periodically issues reports evaluating the current state of educational access, articulation, and other statewide concerns. CPEC also monitors the figures on enrollments, graduates, and student performance. The Department of Finance occasionally conducts management audits in addition to its traditional activity of auditing colleges for compliance with requirements for state funding.

The most comprehensive existing means of evaluation is accreditation. Community colleges are accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), a regional postsecondary accrediting commission. This private group ensures that colleges within the region meet minimum standards established by the members of the association. Public agencies assist by providing the resources necessary for the task.

The fact that accreditation is conferred by a private association has been viewed in some quarters as an argument against using accreditation as a standard for receipt of public monies. Federal agencies are concerned about the use of accreditation as a criterion for distributing certain funds to students and eligible institutions. State-level legislation has been introduced in past years to provide for public, rather than private, accreditation.

The Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office role in evaluation has been carried out in various ways. First, there is direct, though ad hoc, evaluation of programs such as the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services and Handicapped Programs for which the Board itself is partly responsible. Second, Chancellor's Office staff participate on accreditation teams and the Accrediting Commission. Third, the Chancellor's Office is required to monitor college programs for compliance with statutory standards. Fourth, there are efforts to develop tools for district self-evaluation of specific programs such as the Community Colleges Occupational Programs Evaluation System (COPES). COPES is designed to assist a college in self-appraisal of its occupational programs.

Proposed Remedies

In 1979, the Board of Governors proposed: (1) establishing measurable statewide objectives; (2) reviewing and redefining existing minimum standards (regulations) for the receipt of state aid; (3) simplifying existing Education Code provisions which unnecessarily restrict the use of district resources; (4) establishing a process for submission, review, and approval of district comprehensive plans; and (5) establishing a process to determine compliance with and ensure enforcement of minimum standards.

The first of an ongoing series of efforts at step (3) was accomplished by AB 1726 and AB 1729 (1981) to simplify many Education Code provisions which govern the conduct of community college district operations. Efforts have begun on the other steps.

Effective use of community college resources requires that both statewide and local educational objectives be met in the most efficient manner possible. Related evaluation and planning responsibilities can be shared, through accreditation, by the institution and the Chancellor's Office. To identify and implement the specifics of this shared effort, the Chancellor's Office and the Western Association Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges have undertaken a joint project, supported by the federal Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).

After one year, work on the FIPSE Project has resulted in a series of papers (see Appendix B). In addition, a sharing of responsibilities has been proposed for the Project (see Appendix C). Project efforts are underway to augment the Chancellor's Office Information System for purposes of planning and evaluation. Also scheduled for 1982-83 are general regional workshops and specific seminars for colleges undergoing joint accreditation of self-studies. As part of their self-study, these colleges are being asked to conduct in-depth evaluations of their status regarding statewide priorities.

Closely related to the FIPSE Project is the work of the Chancellor's Office Task Force on Planning and Compliance. This Task Force has met frequently in recent months and is working to consolidate planning and review activities of the Chancellor's Office into a comprehensive planning process, the timing and content of which would be coordinated with accreditation. In addition, the Task Force is working on the distinction between statewide planning responsibilities and statewide compliance responsibilities.

Compliance is being improved through a series of steps that will reduce the number and complexity of compliance requirements, make sanctions (for noncompliance) realistic, and reduce the reporting required of districts. As noted above, the first of these steps was passage of legislation to simplify that part of the Education Code dealing with community colleges. The second step, recently completed, is a review of Title 5 regulations for clarity, consistency, necessity, and authority. The third step is a group of changes to regulations that deal with the minimum standards which colleges must meet in order to receive state aid.

Planning Outline

Efforts are underway to design a comprehensive planning process that would encompass and replace the existing planning and review activities of the Chancellor's Office for:

programs and certain courses
facilities
extended opportunity programs and services (EOPS)
handicapped students programs and services (HSPS)
occupational education (VEA)
affirmative action
calendar/schedule
innovative projects

and to add other **areas** such as

student support services
finance

Format

The prospective comprehensive **plan** format includes the following:

- (a) comparison and reconciliation of local goals and objectives with statewide priorities;
- (b) review of Part II of the accreditation self-study (addressing statewide priorities) to show how priorities are being met or if not met, an analysis of the casual reasons; e.g., **different local philosophy, insufficient resources, or other internal or external constraints;**
- (c) projections of expected future trends in district demographics, societal conditions, employment opportunities, community conditions, employment opportunities, community educational preferences, plans of other organizations offering similar education, and resulting levels and patterns of student demand for instruction **and** support services;
- (d) overall short- and long-term plans for meeting current and future district needs and for solving problems identified in (b) **and** (c);
- (e) specific short-term (following year) proposals for

instructional programs
support services
calendar/schedule
staffing
affirmative action
facilities
finance
Innovative Projects
EOPS
HSPS
VEA
General
(including apportionment, fee, contract and grant support)

The annual update would include a review and updating of (a), (b), (c), and (d), together with the appropriate reworking of (e) which contains specific short-term funding proposals.

Review

Under the proposal, Chancellor's Office staff would, each year, review comprehensive plans from some districts and annual updates from others to evaluate progress towards statewide priorities. Aggregate information from each year's evaluation of statewide priorities would form one basis for statewide planning and policymaking.

In those areas for which the state has specific responsibility, Chancellor's Office staff also would review the short-term plans of districts for programs and services and for special funding to determine (a) if proposals appropriately address district needs and statewide priorities, (b) if proposals are consistent with long-term plans, and (c) if district plans have been coordinated with the plans of other local education suppliers. Review also would include assessment of existing programs and support services. Specific approvals would be required for EOPS, HSPS, VEA, new programs, facilities, calendars, affirmative action and innovative projects.

Submission of a district comprehensive plan is proposed as a minimum standard for receipt of state funds. General review of district plans would be confined to their overall adequacy: information and analytical content, breadth of local participation, and coordination with other local organizations. Where plans are judged to be generally inadequate, Chancellor's Office staff would consult with district staff to bring about improvements.

Timing

A comprehensive plan would be developed by a district once every five years in conjunction with the accreditation of (one of) its college(s). Districts would then submit annual plan updates.

Current plans call for the new comprehensive planning mechanism to be tested and, if found successful, implemented according to the following schedule.

1982-83

Districts with colleges undergoing accreditation self-studies during 1982-83 (group "A") will be asked to compare local objectives with statewide priorities and to conduct an indepth evaluation of their progress towards statewide priorities as part of their self-study.

All other districts will be asked to compare local objectives with statewide priorities during 1982-83.

1983-84

Districts with colleges undergoing accreditation self-studies during 1983-84 (group "B") will be asked to compare local objectives and statewide priorities and to conduct an indepth evaluation of their progress on statewide priorities, analyzing gaps (if any) between priority and practice. In addition, districts in group "B" will be asked to develop comprehensive plans in which they will project future conditions and present planning strategies to meet present and future needs, including specific short-term proposals such as, for instance, proposed EOPS activities and expenditures for the following year. These plans would cover the five-year period beginning with 1985-86.

Evaluation of statewide priorities by group "A" will be reviewed in joint accreditation visits. In addition, group "A" will be asked to undertake the same comprehensive planning effort that is expected of group "B."

All other districts would again compare local objectives with statewide priorities. In addition, these districts would be asked to prepare and submit the new consolidated set of short-term proposals for 1985-86. They would not be required to submit comprehensive plans, however.

The first Chancellor's Office review of comprehensive plans from district groups "A" and "B" would take place in the Fall 1984, for the plans covering the five-year period beginning 1985-86.

1984-85

Districts with colleges undergoing accreditation self-studies (group "C") will be asked to compare local objectives with statewide priorities and to conduct an indepth evaluation of their progress on statewide priorities, analyzing gaps (if any) between priority and practice. In addition, group "C" will be asked to develop comprehensive plans in which they will project future conditions and present planning strategies to meet present and future needs, including short-term plan specifics such as, for instance, proposed EOPS activities and expenditures for the following year. These plans would cover the five-year period beginning with 1986-87.

Districts in groups "A" and "B" will be asked to update their plans.

All other districts will be asked to prepare and submit specific short-term proposals, such as, for instance, proposed EOPS activities and expenditures for 1986-87. These districts would not submit a complete comprehensive plan, however.

1985-86 and 1986-87

Remaining districts (those not in groups "A," "B," and "C") will be phased into the comprehensive planning process.

Districts in groups "A," "B," and "C" will update their plans.

Further Development

This implementation schedule, proposed plan format, and review process will undergo further development in consultation with state and local personnel during the next several months and will be proposed for Board of Governors' endorsement early in 1983. At the same time, efforts of the FIPSE Project to develop tools for use by districts in evaluation and planning will continue. Workshops for dissemination of these tools are scheduled for Spring 1983.

Statewide Priorities

At present, there are a multitude of state-level priorities for community colleges implicit in statute, regulations, and other legislative and executive pronouncements. Aside from a rather general set of Board of Governors' goals, however, there is no one explicit or manageable set of statewide priorities against which community college operations may be evaluated and planned. To correct this deficiency, an initial set of statewide priorities is currently being developed by the Board in consultation with both state and local authorities. In addition, staff are developing guidelines to be used by colleges in assessing their achievement of priorities. These guidelines will be added to the accreditation self-study.

Colleges undergoing self-study this year will address statewide priorities in addition to the accreditation standards. Achievement (or lack thereof) of a statewide priority would not bear upon a college's accreditation. Rather, these priority assessments by 20 (or so) colleges each year would be aggregated without identifying specific colleges. Together with other evidence, this aggregation would be used by the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office to make a comprehensive evaluation of the statewide achievement of community college priorities. This evaluation also would form the basis for comprehensive planning and policy-making by the Board and Chancellor's Office.

Accreditation should assess the internal efficiency of a community college: the range, depth, and quality of its instructional programs and services, its management, and how well it serves its students and community. The state, however, should concern itself with external or statewide priorities and the extent to which colleges as a group meet those priorities, in addition to meeting their own local objectives. This general delineation of roles needs to be made explicit.

Initial priorities are scheduled for Board of Governors' endorsement in the Fall of 1982, following review by principal policymakers at both state and local levels. This timing would allow those colleges doing accreditation self-studies during 1982-83 to incorporate assessment of the statewide priorities into their work. Accreditation visits to these colleges are scheduled for 1983-84. Under this schedule, a first comprehensive evaluation of statewide progress toward Board-established priorities can be completed that year.

APPENDIX A

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

PLANNING AND COMPLIANCE TASK FORCE

Juana Barbarita
Administrator for Affirmative
Action Programs

Ronald Dyste
Administrator for EOPS

Rosemary Hovorka
Specialist, College Services

Chuck McIntyre
Director of Analytical Studies

John Meyer
Specialist, Program Evaluation
and Approval

Lynn Miller
Specialist, Financial Services
and District Organization

Tom Nussbaum
General Counsel

John Picco
Specialist, Facilities Planning
and Utilization

IMPROVING COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EVALUATION AND PLANNING
A JOINT PROJECT SUPPORTED BY THE
FUND FOR IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

APPENDIX B

PROJECT PAPERS

ORIGINAL PROJECT PROPOSAL (3/23/81)

PROJECT CONTINUATION PROPOSAL (1/27/82)

BACKGROUND PAPERS

I: ACCJC's Perspective on the Project (9/81)

II: Board of Governors, Chancellor's Office Perspective (9/24/81)

WORKING PAPERS

#1,2 Delineation of Functions: The Chancellor's Office and the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
(Revised 4/18/82)

#3. Preliminary Review of Literature on the Relations Between
Accreditation and State Agencies (1/26/82)

#4. Delineation of Project Responsibilities, Schedule (Revised 5/24/82)

#5. Statewide Objectives (Priorities) (4/22/82)

#6. Survey of Principal Agents

6A. Board of Governors (8/82)

6B. State-Level (8/82)

6C. Local-Level (in progress)

#7. Glossary: Terminology for Use in the FIPSE Project (4/25/82)

#8. Completion of Statewide Information System (6/7/82)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDAS

October 2, 1981

January 28, 1982

April 27, 1982

June 16, 1982

STATUS REPORTS

January 28-29, 1982

March 4, 1982

April, 1982

July 15-16, 1982

APPENDIX C

DELINEATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Improvement of Evaluation and Planning Project

Certain assumptions and expectations should be understood in defining the complementary roles of the state agency (CCC) and the accrediting commission (ACCJC) in the Improvement of Evaluation and Planning Project (FIPSE); and in the Project's potential influence on statewide policies and practices related to accountability of California's community colleges.

Among the assumptions are:

1. The existing dual process of agency review and accreditation self study and visitation is costly, duplicative, and wasteful of local staff and resources.
2. The state agency and the accrediting commission, heretofore, have given insufficient attention to institutional evaluation and planning, and to the improvement of such capabilities.
3. Current institutional and agency planning tends to be segmental as a result of specialization in state agency functions, and perhaps because of the discreteness of commission standards.
4. Review of local effort has generally been based on process rather than outcome criteria.
5. Future state accountability demands are likely to emphasize compliance if agency and commission responsibilities are not coordinated so as to promote comprehensive planning and student outcome evaluation.

Major expectations are:

1. Excessive, duplicative, and costly state compliance requirements can be reduced so that only the most critical mandates are monitored or enforced by the state agency.
2. Specialized state agency functions can be coordinated in order to (a) encourage comprehensive planning; (b) eliminate duplicative reporting requirements; and (c) facilitate joint visits between agency and commission.

3. A set of statewide priorities can be derived cooperatively from CCC goals, legal mandates, and the most universal goals and objectives of local institutions.
4. Comprehensive planning documents can be prepared so as to be useful for both agency review and accreditation visits.
5. Improved planning and evaluation capabilities can be achieved through training workshops jointly designed and conducted by the state agency and the accrediting commission in cooperation with the colleges.
6. Coordinated development of a dual purpose information system should result in cost savings to colleges, uses of comparative data for self studies and comprehensive plans, and in improved qualitative review of plans and programs.

Other states are coordinating reviews by state agencies and accreditation visits (see working paper 3). However, the California FIPSE Project goes beyond the common wisdom that whereas the state agency is responsible for assessing the public interests, the accrediting commission complements this state function by assessing the internal efficiency of a college in relationship to its own stated purposes. Specifically, the Project has as objectives (1) training for improved capabilities in evaluation and planning; (2) completion of information systems useful at the state and local levels; and (3) use of institutional planning documents for joint accreditation and agency review visits.

Whereas such joint efforts should enhance the credibility of college and state system accountability, they also bring into focus concerns for the integrity of voluntary accreditation on the one hand and the rigor of agency review on the other. Thus the need to delineate responsibilities of the two Project sponsors. In this working paper it seems appropriate to suggest related responsibilities of the field advisory committee, consultants, and the local institutions. Chart 1 presents a matrix of objectives, participants, and responsibilities.

Chart 1 will be amended after appropriate consultations to delineate state agency requirements for Hawaii.

CHART 1
PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
TARGET DATES

Target Dates
✓ Accomplished

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	STATE AGENCY - - JOINT - -	ACCREDITING COMMISSION	ADVISORY COMMITTEE	CONSULTANTS	INSTITUTIONS
1. Promote understanding and support of the <u>9/81 - 9/82</u>	✓ Get Chancellor and Board approval ✓ Agency staff participation SELECT AND MEET WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND CONSULTANTS CONSULT WITH LEGISLATIVE AND CONSTITUENCY GROUPS	✓ Get Commission approval ✓ Consult with field leaders	✓ Review proposals-clarify objectives/procedures ✓ Interpret field interests and concerns	✓ Position papers on literature; delineation of roles; questions for field survey Survey of legislative and policymaking groups <u>5/82 - 7/82</u>	✓ Make known college needs and interests Survey principal agents <u>5/82 - 9/82</u>
2. Define roles and responsibilities <u>1/82 - 12/82</u>	✓ Provide agency documents and identify relationship issues Proposals on compliance and agency role in planning <u>6/82</u> Insure accountability to Legislature <u>4/82-Continuing</u> Strengthen role in planning/evaluation <u>4/82 - 6/83</u> FACILITATE DECISIONS AND ADOPT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES <u>10/82</u>	✓ Provide commission documents and identify relationship issues ✓ Proposed use of standards in improving planning and evaluation Protect integrity of accrediting process <u>Continuing</u>	✓ Critique papers and make recommendations Advise on duplication of reporting and local capabilities	✓ Working papers; delineation of roles in state network; and on Project responsibilities ✓ Paper on CCC goals and ACCJC standards ✓ Consult with directors in policy and procedures	Consider and respond to proposed role of colleges in Project objectives <u>9/82 - 12/82</u> CEOs <u>10/82</u> ALOs <u>11/82</u>
3. Complete statewide information system <u>6/82 - 6/83</u>	✓ Determine existing and needed data and sources <u>6/82</u> Design models for use in training and local planning <u>9/82 - 12/82</u> Determine scope and uses of system within agency capabilities and resources <u>9/82</u> Determine most cost-effective means of collecting data and making available for state and local use <u>12/82</u>	Propose additional data from self studies <u>6/82</u> Recommend uses of system in self studies <u>9/82</u> Recommend uses of system in accreditation review <u>9/82</u>	Review and advise on content and uses of system at local level <u>6/82</u>	Consult with state agency on system design and uses <u>6/82</u> Propose uses of system in training <u>7/82</u>	Provide necessary data; determine uses in planning and self study <u>6/82 - 5/83</u> Use and evaluate information system <u>1982-83</u>

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	STATE AGENCY	- - JOINT - -	ACCREDITING COMMISSION	ADVISORY COMMITTEE	CONSULTANTS	INSTITUTIONS
4. Plan self-study seminars for 20 colleges (joint commission and agency visits) Two 2-day seminars 1-North 1-South <u>Summer 1982</u> Hawaii One 2-day seminar <u>2/83</u>	Prepare training materials and problem solving techniques for improving planning using information system and state-wide objectives <u>Summer 1982</u> ADOPT TRAINING PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE TO PREPARE COLLEGES FOR JOINT VISITS <u>Summer 1982</u> APPOINT TRAINING STAFF, ISSUE SCHEDULE AND AGENDAS <u>9/82</u> ADOPT OBJECTIVES AND METHODS FOR OUTCOME SURVEYS <u>9/82</u>		Prepare training materials and techniques for use of standards in preparing self studies <u>Summer 1982</u>	Review plans and test against field realities; propose alternate strategies <u>9/82</u> Review and advise on consumer survey proposals <u>9/82</u>	Propose seminar objectives and methods for helping colleges prepare for joint visits <u>Summer 1982</u> Advise on staff, logistics materials for seminars <u>Summer 1982</u> Position paper on outcome survey methods, and uses <u>8/82</u>	Review seminar plans, appoint college participant, prepare needed materials <u>9/82</u> Plan for using seminar experiences in making arrangements for joint visit <u>1982-83</u>
5. Conduct self-study seminars for 20 colleges Two 2-day seminars 1-North 1-South North-10/12-13/82 South-10/14-15/82 Hawaii-2/83	PROVIDE LEADERSHIP, STAFF, AND FUNDING FOR TRAINING SEMINARS <u>10/82</u> Incorporate seminar experiences in comprehensive planning and evaluation <u>11/82-83</u>		Share seminar experience and evaluation with visiting teams through training workshops <u>9/83</u>	Review evaluation reports of seminars and make recommendations for improvements <u>1/83</u>	Consult with colleges during self-study year <u>1982-83</u> Participate in seminars and evaluate <u>10/83</u>	Ready seminar participants and make necessary <u>10/82</u> Utilize seminar experiences in preparing for joint visits <u>1982-83</u>
6. Plan regional workshop (improve evaluation and planning capabilities) Five 2-day workshops California <u>9/82 - 1/83</u> Hawaii <u>2/83</u>	Recommend agency staff for workshops <u>1/83</u> APPOINT TRAINING TEAMS FOR REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ADOPT SIMULATED ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES EMPHASIZING INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUTS AND LEARNER OUTCOMES <u>1/83</u> Responsible for workshop logistics and funding <u>3/83</u>		Recommend commission members for workshops <u>1/83</u> Assist in interpreting objectives to field <u>9/82 - 1/83</u> Advise on workshop logistics <u>3/83</u>	Review workshop plans and make recommendations <u>1/83</u> Assist in interpreting objectives to field <u>9/82 - 1/83</u>	Propose workshop objectives, staff, methods, and evaluations <u>8/82</u> Prepare for workshops Evaluation and reporting plans <u>3/83</u>	Consider appropriate participants <u>Fall 1982</u> Prepare requester materials <u>2/83</u> Consider use of workshop experiences in college evaluation and planning <u>3/83-Continuing</u>

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	STATE AGENCY	- - JOINT - -	ACCREDITING COMMISSION	ADVISORY COMMITTEE	CONSULTANTS	INSTITUTIONS
7. Conduct regional workshops Five 2-day workshops California <u>2/83 - 4/83</u> Hawaii <u>2/83</u>	Carry out logistics and funding plans <u>3/83</u> COORDINATE WORKSHOP STAFF AND INTERPRET OBJECTIVES OF AGENCY AND COMMISSION TO PARTICIPANTS <u>3/83</u>		Participate in workshops <u>3/83</u> Provide materials <u>3/83</u>	Participate in workshops upon request <u>3/83</u>	Take part in workshops <u>3/83</u> Evaluate and report <u>4/83</u>	Arrange for college participants <u>2/83</u> Provide requested materials <u>2/83</u>
8. Plan for coordinated visits <u>1983-84</u>	Determine agency objectives and orient staff members <u>Spring 1983</u> AGREE ON MEMBERS OF JOINT VISIT TEAMS <u>Spring 1983</u> PREPARE GUIDANCE MATERIALS FOR JOINT TEAM MEMBERS <u>Spring 1983</u> Recommend uses of self-study data in info system and agency evaluation <u>Spring 1983</u>		Determine commission objectives and orient team members <u>Spring 1983</u> Set policy on use of self studies outside accreditation process <u>1/83</u>	Review plans and make recommendations <u>Spring 1983</u>	Advise on objectives for joint visits <u>Spring 1983</u> Prepare proposal for evaluation <u>Spring 1983</u> Review self study and final plan for joint visit <u>Spring 1983</u> Advise on economic benefits from joint visits <u>Spring 1983</u> Evaluation materials <u>Spring 1983</u>	Plan for joint visit with attention to coordinating self study and comprehensive plan <u>Spring 1983</u>
9. Conduct and assess joint visits <u>1983-1984</u>	Appoint agency staff members <u>Spring 1983</u> PREPARE TEAMS AND INSTITUTIONS FOR OBJECTIVES, METHODS, AND USES OF JOINT VISITS <u>9/83</u> Assess value to agency and make recommendations <u>5/84</u>		Appoint commission members <u>Spring 1983</u> Assess value to commission and make recommendations <u>5/84</u>	Review assessments and make recommendation <u>4/84</u> Take part in joint visits if invited <u>1983-1984</u>	Take part in joint visits <u>1983-1984</u> Evaluate and prepare reports <u>Spring 1984</u>	Prepare for and host joint visits <u>1983-1984</u> Coordinate with consultants in evaluations of visits <u>5/84</u>

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	STATE AGENCY - - JOINT - -	ACCREDITING COMMISSION	ADVISORY COMMITTEE	CONSULTANTS	INSTITUTIONS
10. Future collaboration and dissemination <u>1984</u>	ADOPT POLICIES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION AND STRATEGIES FOR DISSEMINATION <u>6/84</u> Make decisions about institutional review <u>6/84</u>	Make accreditation decisions <u>1 & 6/84</u>	Review proposals and make recommendations <u>6/84</u>	Working paper on future developments <u>5/84</u>	
11. Improve evaluation and planning <u>1984-1985</u>	Reconsider statewide goals and objectives as a result of first 20 visits <u>Summer 1984</u> Reaffirm or modify statewide goals/objectives <u>Summer 1984</u> QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF JOINT VISITS IN REFERENCE TO IMPROVING EVALUATION AND PLANNING CAPABILITIES <u>Summer 1984</u> Refine info system in light of use in training and joint visits <u>Summer 1984</u> ADOPT POLICIES FOR CONTINUED COLLABORATION AND IMPROVEMENT <u>1984-1985</u>	Review standards and guidelines for self studies and visits <u>6/84</u> Revise manual if appropriate <u>Summer 1984</u> Determine commission interests in further collaboration <u>6/84</u>	Review scope and assessments of evaluation and planning workshops and institutional efforts <u>5/84</u>	Interview participants in joint visits re evaluation and planning capabilities <u>Spring 1984</u> Recommend improvements in light of Project objectives <u>5/84</u>	Make qualitative evaluations of improvements in evaluation and planning. Make recommendations to Project <u>Spring 1984</u> Cooperate with consultants in assessment of changes <u>Spring 1984</u>
12. Effective resource allocations <u>1984-1985</u>	Continue intra-agency collaboration to promote comprehensive planning <u>1984-1985</u> Staff recommend and Board approve policies for allocations under control of agency <u>Fall 1984</u> JOINT REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION TO DEMONSTRATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPROVE EVALUATION AND PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY TO STATE AND LOCAL COMMUNITY <u>1984-1985</u>	Quality control and internal efficiency as expectation for well-planned self study <u>1984-1985</u>	Review proposals relating evaluation and planning to resource allocation. Make recommendations <u>1984-1985</u>	Assess objectives relating evaluation and planning to resource allocation <u>Spring 1984</u> Report on appropriate literature <u>Spring 1984</u>	Review proposal and make recommendations <u>6/84</u>

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	STATE AGENCY - - JOINT - -	ACCREDITING COMMISSION	ADVISORY COMMITTEE	CONSULTANTS	INSTITUTIONS
13. Improve programs for learning <u>1984-1985</u>	Increase attention to program outputs in evaluation and planning <u>1984-1985</u> Incorporate more comparative program output data in statewide information system <u>1984-1985</u> ASSESS AGENCY AND COMMISSION OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT <u>Fall 1984</u>	Assess uses of standards and joint visits in program improvements <u>1/85</u> Revise standards and manual if appropriate <u>6/85</u>	Critique working papers and evidence for improvements and make recommendations <u>Fall 1984</u>	Study relationship between improved evaluation and planning and program changes <u>Summer 1984</u> Paper on relationships between process variables (program changes) and outcome variables (student learning) <u>Fall 1984</u>	Share models of program changes as results of evaluation and planning <u>Continuing</u>
14. Improve student outcomes <u>1984-1985</u>	Increase attention to student outcome in evaluation and planning Include more comparative data on student outcomes in information system DISSEMINATE FINDINGS SHOWING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REVIEW PROCESSES AND DESIRED STUDENT OUTCOMES <u>Summer 1984</u>	Review standards in light of emphasis on assessing student outcomes <u>6/84</u>	Review materials on student outcome assessment and make recommendations <u>5/84</u>	Evaluation paper on Project achievements re this objective <u>Summer 1984</u> Propose dissemination strategies <u>6/84</u>	Share models of student outcome assessments <u>Continuing</u> Provide data for info system <u>Continuing</u>
STATE AGENCY HAWAII					
Similar responsibilities to be agreed to after consultation					

It is anticipated that early in the Project a set of statewide priorities will be derived from existing CCC goals. As these priorities are used and refined in the evaluation and planning processes of the workshops, joint visits, and other agency and field activities, they may then be proposed as a set of statewide objectives for field review and CCC Board of Governors adoption.

The FIPSE Project's policies, objectives, and practices can be viewed as on-going modes of improving institutional accountability both to the state and to local communities. The Project is a vehicle for institutional, agency, and commission improvement, leading to recognition of accountability within the community college network in making efficient uses of scarce resources while demonstrating attention to the improvement of learner outcomes.

After review of this working paper on delineation of responsibilities, a time-frame was then agreed to by the Project directors and consultant. This revision shows the activities which have already been completed and recommended target dates or periods for both near-term and long-term responsibilities.

Dale Tillery
Revised 4-24-82

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

JAN 14 1983